IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 8142 of 2003
with
Special Civil Application
Nos. 8105, 8348, 8349, 8440, 8482, 8498,
8550, 8553 and 8561 of 2003

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE P.B.MAJMUDAR

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgement? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

PARESHKUMAR KHANABHAI PARIKH

Versus

HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT

Appearance:
Special Civil Application No.8142 of 2003.
MR BM MANGUKIYA for the Petitioner.
Mr.S.N. Shelat, Advocate General, with
MR JB PARDIWALA for the Respondent.
LAW OFFICER BRANCH for the Respondent.

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE P.B.MAJMUDAR

Date of decision: 26/06/2003

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Special Civil Application Nos. 8105, 8142, 8348, 8349, 8440, 8482 and 8498 of 2003 are already admitted.

So far as Special Civil Application Nos. 8550, 8553 and 8561 of 2003 are concerned, Rule returnable today. Mr.Pardiwala waives service of rule on behalf of the respondent in each of the said matters.

Mr.S.N. Shelat, learned Advocate General, along with Mr.J.B. Pardiwala, Standing Counsel for the High Court, states that in order to avoid delay in the recruitment process in view of the pending litigation, the High Court, on its administrative side, has now decided to call all the eligible candidates, who have applied in response to the advertisement by submitting complete and valid applications, for the purpose of written examination. He, however, submitted that the respondent reserves its right to reject incomplete applications and the applications which are not in consonance with the requirement of the advertisement. He further submitted that this statement is made without prejudice to its earlier contention that it was competent for it to short list candidates for written examination. Since the respondent has now decided to call all eligible candidates, who have submitted complete and valid applications, in response to the advertisement in question, now, it is not necessary to examine the question whether the view canvassed earlier in connection with resorting to short listing candidates for the purpose of written examination is valid or not. It is clarified that this point is not concluded and this Court has not expressed any view on the merits of the issue either way.

In view of the aforesaid statement of the learned Advocate General, the petitioners are not pressing their petitions and all these petitions are disposed of in view of the statement of the learned Advocate General. Rule issued in each of these matters is discharged. No costs.

26th June, 2003 (P.B. Majmudar, J.)

***

(apj)